

REMARKS

A. Introduction

Claims 83, 84, 89, 90, and 92 were pending in the application.

In the final Office Action mailed June 5, 2008, claims 83, 84, 89, 90, and 92 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Lamming*, et al., U.S. 5,862,321 (hereinafter, *Lamming*), in view of *Shapiro* et al., U.S. 5,991,810 (hereinafter *Shapiro*).

In response, applicants are amending the claims for clarity. Support for the amendments is found in Fig 11 and Paragraphs 109-110 of the application as published as US 2005/0102353. Accordingly, no new matter is being added.

B. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 83, 84, 89, 90, and 92 were rejected as being unpatentable over *Lamming* in view of *Shapiro*.

Lamming discloses a system for transferring electronic documents between portable computer devices and between such devices and various forms of office equipment. *Lamming*, col. 1, ll. 5-10. According to the disclosure of *Lamming*, a file server maintains a database associating electronic documents with document references, the latter taking up substantially less storage space than the former, and, accordingly, being more amenable to storage on and transmission between small portable electronic transport devices. *Lamming*, col. 3, ll. 30-63.

As the Office Action concedes, *Lamming* fails to teach or suggest retrieving a reference from a cache. Neither does *Lamming* teach or suggest a client computer, having a client lookup manager with an associated cache, where the client look manager receives, from the client computer, a request to access a network service; searches the associated cache for an instance of the requested network service; returns, when the search is successful, the instance of the requested network service to the client computer; sends, when the search is unsuccessful, a request to a lookup service identifying a requested network service; and stores received responses to the request in the associated cache.

Shapiro is cited for disclosing retrieving a reference from a cache. Whether or not this is true, such disclosure fails to cure the deficiencies noted above. As a result, claims 83, 84, 89, 90,

Serial No.: 10/669,692
Docket No.: 30014200-1206
Amendment "B" dated October 6, 2008
Reply to the Office Action mailed June 5, 2008

and 92 are patentable over the combination of Lamming and Shapiro.

C. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that claims 83, 84, 89, 90, and 92 are allowable and that the application is in condition for allowance. Early notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

If any further fees are required in connection with the filing of this amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3140.

	Respectfully submitted, SONNENSCHEN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
By	/ <i>Michael L. Day</i> /
	Michael L. Day, Reg. No. 55101 P.O. Box 061080 Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower Chicago, IL 60606-1080 415-882-5064 (telephone) 415-882-0300 (facsimile) ATTORNEYS UNDER RULE 34